REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-4 and 7-11 are pending. Claims 5-6 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claims 1-4 have been amended. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, on page 21, paragraph 36 of the specification of this invention.

Reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested. No new matter is added by way of the present amendments.

II. Rejections under 35. U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-4 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner contends that the term "thin metal film" is a relative term because "thin" is not defined by the claim, the specification provides no standard and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

The claims have been amended to remove the term "thin" and include "a metal film layer having a thickness of the range of 10 nm to 300 nm." Thus it is asserted that these amendments obviate the rejections and therefore the Examiner's rejections should be withdrawn. For these reasons, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of the above claims.

III. Rejections under 35. U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over JP 10-193494 ("JP '494") in view of US 6,815,079 ("Rosenbaum").

The Examiner contends that JP '494 discloses a reflective multilayer film comprising a base layer, a metal layer, and a surface layer. The base layer is a voided white film comprising a polymer and a white pigment, wherein the film has a light transmittance of less than 50%.

The Examiner also contends that Rosenbaum discloses that it is well-known in the art to form reflective voided white films from a composition comprising polylactide resins and a white pigment in typical amounts of 1-25wt%.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant notes that the reflective film of JP '494 deteriorates when used as a film on a liquid crystal displaying device, as well as having a problem with decreasing the reflectance of the reflective film. (Specification, p.2, lines 17-23.) Furthermore, JP '494 does not disclose aliphatic polyester based resins. Rather, the film base material used in JP '494 is a polyethylene terephthalate film (JP '494, paragraphs 11-12.) In Applicant's invention, Comparative Examples 1 and 2 show a reflective film having a polyethylene terephthalate film. The polyethylene terephthalate film used in Comparative Example 1, trade name DIAFOIL W-400, is the same as the film used in Example 3 of JP '494. According to Table 1, the reflective films of Comparative Examples 1 and 2 exhibit an average reflectance of less than 95% and a decrease in reflectance of 5% or more after irradiation with ultraviolet rays, indicating that they had a poor yellowing preventing property.

Furthermore, the opaque biaxially oriented film disclosed in Rosenbaum must comprise at least one cycloolefin copolymer ("COC")-containing layer. In Rosenbaum, there is only one film that comprises no COC-containing layer. (Rosenbaum, Comparative Example 1.) It consists of about one hundred percent by weight of polylactide polymer. Rosenbaum noted that a film comprised solely of polylactide polymer could only be stretched to a longitudinal stretching factor of 2.5 and that higher longitudinal stretching factors resulted in tears. Based on this disclosure in Rosenbaum, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have thought to use a polylactide polymer only film in order to optimize the properties of a film.

Additionally, there is no reason to combine the two references. JP '494 does not disclose aliphatic polyester based resins, but bases the crux of its inventive step on polyethylene terphthalate. Rosenbaum discloses using polylactide polyesters alone in its invention, but shows that without a COC-containing layer, mechanical properties are not optimized. One of ordinary skill in the art would not think to use a polylactide polyester

alone in order to maximize mechanical properties and therefore would not think to combine Rosenbaum and JP '494 in such a way as to leave out the COC-containing layer.

Finally, ultraviolet rays that generate from a light source and hit a liquid crystal displaying device cause the film on the display device to yellow. These rays that deteriorate the film appear in the short wavelength region between wavelength region of 420 nm to 550 nm. In JP '494, the diffuse reflectance is measured in the wavelength of 550 nm. (JP '494, p. 5, paragraph 15.) Even if the diffuse reflectance drop in the wavelength of 550 nm by ultraviolet rays irradiation is slight, the reflectance drop in the wavelength region of 420 nm to 700 nm can be much larger. A large reflectance drop causes a luminescence drop, which is a practical property. Therefore the prevention of yellowing must be measured with an average reflectance at a wavelength of 420 nm to 700 nm, and this is not the case in JP '494. One of ordinary skill in the art would not assume that a reflectance drop in the wavelength of 550 nm in Rosenbaum would automatically translate to a drop in the average reflectance at a wavelength of 420 nm to 700 nm and further translate to a luminescence drop.

Based on these results, the Applicant's invention is non-obvious in view of JP '494 in view of Rosenbaum to one ordinarily skilled in the art.

Reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejections based on Solomon are requested. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: August 12, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Louis J. DelJuidice
Registration No.: 47,522
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station
New York, New York 10008-0770
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant